US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

7 Day

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba PMRA Submission #: 1..... EPA MRID#: 45386311 Data Requirement: PMRA Data Code: {.....} EPA DP Barcode: D284719 OECD Data Point: **{....** EPA MRID: 45386311 EPA Guideline: 123-2 Test material: AE F160459 Purity: 96.8% Common name: Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite Chemical name: IUPAC: methyl-2-[3-(4.6-dimethoxyprimidin-2-yl) ureidosulfonyl]-4methanesulfonamidomethylbenzoate CAS name: Not reported CAS No.: Not reported Synonyms: Not reported Signature: Riteca Byan
Date: 9/26/03

Signature: Date: 9/26/03

Date: 9/26/03

Date: 1/09/04

Date: 1/09/04 Primary Reviewer: Rebecca Bryan Staff Scientist, Dynamac Corporation QC Reviewer: Teri Myers, Ph.D. Staff Scientist, Dynamac Corporation LCOLASata Primary Reviewer: Tim Bargar {EPA/OECD/PMRA} Secondary Reviewer(s): | ..... Date: {...... {EPA/OECD/PMRA} Company Code **|.....** [For PMRA] **Active Code {.....**} [For PMRA] EPA PC Code 122009 Date Evaluation Completed: {dd-mmm-yyyy}

CITATION: Sowig, P. and Weller, O. 2000. Duckweed (Lemna gibba G3) Growth Inhibition Test, AE F160459, substance, pure, (Metabolite of AE F130060). Unpublished study performed by Aventis CropScience GmbH, Frankfort, Germany. Laboratory Study Identification No. CE00/058. Study submitted by Aventis CropScience, Research Triangle Park, NC. Experimental start date July 14, 2000 and experimental termination date July 21, 2000. The final report issued August 28, 2000.



PMRA Submission #: }....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

In a 7-day acute toxicity study, freshwater floating aquatic vascular plants Duckweed, *Lemna gibba* G3. were exposed to Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) at mean measured concentrations of 0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L under static-renewal conditions. Nominal concentrations were 0.1, 0.18, 0.32, 0.56, 1.0, 1.8, 3.2, 5.6, and 10 mg/L. Mean frond number decreased as test concentrations increased, when compared to the dilution water control: frond number was significantly reduced at treatment groups equal to and greater than 0.53 mg/L. Mean percent inhibition was 0, 0, 2, 8, 12, 65, 79, 86, and 88% in the 0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. By day 7, the mean dry weights were 23.4, 23.3, 23.1, 23.1, 22.7, 21.9, 10.8, 5.7, 5.8, and 3.9 mg in the 0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. Dry weight and growth rate were significantly reduced at the 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups. By day 7, yellow colored fronds were observed in the 0.93 and 1.7 mg/L treatment groups. The 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups had yellow fronds and fronds not fully separated. Frond number was the most sensitive endpoint; the NOEC was 0.29 mg/L and the EC<sub>50</sub> was 1.5 mg/L.

This toxicity study is scientifically sound and satisfies the U.S. EPA Guideline Subdivision J, §123-2 for an aquatic vascular plant study with *Lemna gibba*. As a result, this study is classified as Core.

### Results Synopsis

Test Organism: Lemna gibba G3

Test Type: Static-renewal

### Number of fronds:

NOEC: 0.29 mg/L

EC<sub>50</sub>: 0.20 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.10-0.39 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.5 mg/L 95% C.I.: 1.1-2.0 mg/L

Slope: 1.89±0.195

#### Dry Weight:

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>05</sub>: 0.22 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.11-0.46 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.9 mg/L 95% C.I.: 1.4-2.6 mg/L

Slope: 1.75±0.194

### **Growth Rate:**

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>0s</sub>: 0.31 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.19-0.50 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 2.8 mg/L 95% C.I.: 2.4-3.4 mg/L

Slope: 1.71±0.132

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number (most sensitive), dry weight, and growth rate

PMRA Submission #: \....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

## I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

GUIDELINE FOLLOWED: The test was based on the following guidelines: OECD Guideline no. 201, US-

EPA Subdivision J, §123-2, and American Society for Testing and Materials Guide E 1415-91. The following deviations from U.S. EPA Guideline 123-2 are

noted:

The pretest health of the test organism was not reported.

- The number of plants tested (3-4 plants) was less than the required 5 plants; therefore, there were 12 fronds per replicate, instead of the 15 fronds per replicate that is recommended.
- 3. The storage conditions of the test chemical, carbon source of the growth medium, and some dilution water characteristics were not reported.

These deviations did not affect the acceptability or the validity of the study.

COMPLIANCE:

Signed and dated GLP, Quality Assurance and No Data Confidentiality statements

were provided.

## A. MATERIALS:

1. Test Material

Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459)

Description:

White powder

Lot No./Batch No.: AE F160459 00 1B97 0001

Purity:

96.8%

### Stability of Compound

Under Test Conditions: Measured concentrations (days 0, 3, and 5) for new test solutions ranged from 91.9 to 115.1% of nominal concentrations and measured concentrations (days 3, 5, and 7) of old test concentrations ranged from 87.7 to 101.9% of nominal concentrations, showing that the test material was stable under test conditions. OECD requirements were not reported.

(OECD requires water solubility, stability in water and light, pKa, Pow, vapor pressure of test compound)

Storage conditions of test chemicals: Not reported.

## 2. Test organism:

Name: Duckweed. Lemna gibba

EPA requires a vascular species: Lemna gibba.

Strain, if provided: G3

Source: AgrEvo USA Company, Pikeville, NC (original supplier: Plant Hormone Laboratory, USDA,

Age of inoculum: 6 weeks

Method of cultivation: 20X AAP culture medium

## **B. STUDY DESIGN:**

- a) Range-finding Study: No range-finding study was reported.
- b) Definitive Study

Table 1 . Experimental Parameters

Parameter	Details	Remarks	
	Details	Criteria	
Acclimation period: culturing media and conditions: (same as test or not)	Approximately 6 weeks 20X AAP medium; same as test.		
health: (any toxicity observed)	Not reported.		
Test system static/static renewal/ renewal rate for static renewal:	Static-renewal	EPA expects the test concentrations to be renewed every 3 to 4 days (one renewal for the 7 day test, 3-4 renewals for the 14 day test).	
Incubation facility	Environmental chamber-water bath		
Duration of the test	7 days	EPA requires a duration of 14 days. Seven day studies will be	
Test vessel naterial: (glass/polystyrene) ize: ill volume:	Glass Erlenmeyer-flasks 300 mL 150 mL	accepted for review by the Agency.	
Details of growth medium ame:	20X AAP medium		
H at test initiation: H at test termination: helator used: arbon source:	NaHCO	EPA recommend the following culture media: Modified hoagland's E+ or 20X-AAP. Chelators are not recommended.	

Parameter	Details	Remarks  Criteria
If non-standard nutrient medium was used, detailed composition provided (Yes/No)	Not applicable	Criteria
Dilution water source/type: pH: water pretreatment (if any):  Total Organic Carbon: particulate matter: metals: pesticides: chlorine:	Reagent grade water 7.5±0.1 Deionized water which is additionally filtered by an ultrafiltration, ion exchange and a charcoal unit. Not reported	EPA recommends a pH of ~5.0. A solution pH of 7.5 is acceptable if type 20X-AAP nutrient media is used.
Indicate how the test material is added to the medium (added directly or used stock solution)	Stock solution	
Aeration or agitation	Not reported	
Sediment used (for rooted aquatic vascular plants) origin: extural classification (% sand, silt and clay): organic carbon (%): eographic location:	Not applicable	
lumber of replicates ontrol: olvent control: eatments:	3 N/A 3	
umber of plants/replicate	3-4 plants per replicate	The number of plants tested (3-4 plants) were less than the required 5 plants.
umber of fronds/plant	12 fronds per replicate at test initiation	EPA requires 5 plants.  There were probably three fronds per plant.  EPA requires 3 fronds per plant.

Parameter	Details	Remarks  Criteria		
Test concentrations nominal: measured:	0.1, 0.18, 0.32, 0.56, 1.0, 1.8, 3.2, 5.6, and 10 mg/L  0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L	Mean measured concentrations were reviewer-calculated from mean fresh water and mean aged water		
Solvent (type, percentage, if used)	N/A · ·	7 7 9		
Method and interval of analytical verification	HPLC; new test solutions at 0, 3, and 5 days and old test solutions at 3, 5 and 7 days.			
Test conditions temperature: photoperiod: light intensity and quality:	24.0-24.5°C continuous light	EPA temperature: 25°C EPA photoperiod: continuous EPA light: 5.0 Klux (±15%)		
Reference chemical (if used) name: concentrations:	None			
Other parameters, if any	None			

# 2. Observations:

Table 2: Observation parameters

<u>Parameters</u>	Details	Remarks/Criteria
Parameters measured (eg: number of fronds, plant dry weight or other toxicity symptoms)	Number of fronds, dry weights, growth rates, and toxicity symptoms (yellow colored fronds and fronds not fully separated).	
Measurement technique for frond number and other end points	Direct counts	
Observation intervals	3, 5, and 7 days.	

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #: 1.....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Parameters	Details	Remarks/Criteria
Other observations, if any	None	
Indicate whether there was an exponential growth in the control	Yes, average frond number at day 7 was 16x greater than average frond number at day 0.	
Were raw data included?	Replicate data provided	

## II. RESULTS and DISCUSSION:

# A. INHIBITORY EFFECTS:

Mean frond number decreased as test concentrations increased, when compared to the dilution water control. Mean percent inhibition was 0,0,2,8,12,65,79,86, and 88% in the 0.1,0.17,0.29,0.53,0.93,1.7,3.0,5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. By day 7, the mean dry weights were 23.4,23.3,23.1,23.1,22.7,21.9,10.8,5.7,5.8, and 3.9 mg in the 0.1,0.17,0.29,0.53,0.93,1.7,3.0,5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively.

The mean doubling times were 1.8, 1.8, 1.8, 1.8, 1.8, 1.8, 1.8, 2.8, 4.1, 5.8, and 7.6 days in the 0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. The mean increase in biomass was 22.0, 21.9, 21.7, 21.7, 21.3, 20.5, 9.4, 4.3, 4.4, and 2.5 in the 0.1, 0.17, 0.29, 0.53, 0.93, 1.7, 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups, respectively.

By day 7, yellow colored fronds were observed in the 0.93 and 1.7 mg/L treatment groups. The 3.0, 5.3, and 9.6 mg/L treatment groups had yellow fronds and fronds not fully separated.

Table 3: Effect of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) on frond number of Duckweed, Lemna gibba

Treatment <sup>1</sup> Initial fro (estimated number/t measured and solution		Mean frond number at <sup>2</sup>				Mean Growth Rate at	Mean Dry Weight of Fronds
nominal concentration) mg/L		3 days	5 days	7 days	% inhibition at 7 days <sup>3</sup>	Day 7	(biomass) (mg) <sup>2</sup>
Negative control (dilution water)	12	39	86	192		0.396	23.4
0.1 (0.10)	12	40	85	191	0	0.395	23.3
0.17 (0.18)	12	40	86	191	0	0.395	23.1
0.29 (0.32)	12	37	82	189	2	0.393	23.1
0.53 (0.56)	12	34	78	177	8	0.384	22.7
0.93 (1.0)	12	34	70	168	12	0.377	21.9
1.7 (1.8)	12	26	37	68	65	0.247	10.8
3.0 (3.2)	12	20	32	40	79	0.171	5.7
5.3 (5.6)	12	18	27	28	86	0.119	5.8
9.6 (10.0)	12	18	23	23	88	0.093	3.9
Reference chemical if used)	Not applicable	<del></del>	<del></del>			0.033	J.7

Mean measured concentrations of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite were reviewer-calculated. Nominal concentrations are in parentheses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mean frond number and dry weights were reviewer-calculated from replicate data.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>% inhibition was determined by comparing the treatment groups to the dilution water control.

<sup>\*</sup> Significantly different from dilution water control.

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #: {..

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Table 4: Statistical endpoint values.

Statistical Endpoint <sup>a</sup>	frond No.	growth rate	dry weight (biomass)
NOEC or EC <sub>05</sub> (mg/L)	0.56	0.56	0.56
LOEC (mg/L)	1.0	1.0	1.0
IC <sub>s0</sub> or EC <sub>s0</sub> (mg/L) (95% C.I.)	Not reported	2.6 (1.8 to 3.2)	1.7 (1.0 to 1.8)
other (IC <sub>25</sub> /EC <sub>25</sub> )	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Reference chemical NOAEC ICsp/ECsn	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not reported

B. REPORTED STATISTICS: The formulas used for growth rates, doubling time, and mean percent inhibitions on found on pages 18 and 19. The NOEC was verified using Analysis of Variance, General Linear Models with DUNCAN's Multiple Range Test Procedures (SAS 1989). The EC<sub>50</sub> values were determined using binomial probability.

### Biomass:

NOEC: 0.56 mg/L

EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.7 mg/L

95% C.I.: 1.0-1.8 mg/L

Slope: N/A

#### Growth Rate:

NOEC: 0.56 mg/L

EC<sub>50</sub>: 2.6 mg/L

95% C.I.: 1.8-3.2 mg/L

Slope: N/A

# C. VERIFICATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS:

Statistical Method: Frond number, dry weight, and growth rate data satisfied the assumptions of ANOVA, so this test, followed by William's multiple comparison test was used to determine the NOEC via TOXSTAT statistical software. The  $EC_{05}$  and  $EC_{50}$  values were determined using the Probit method via Nuthatch statistical

# Number of fronds:

NOEC: 0.29 mg/L

EC<sub>05</sub>: 0.20 mg/L

95% C.I.: 0.10-0.39 mg/L

EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.5 mg/L

95% C.I.: 1.1-2.0 mg/L

Slope: 1.89±0.195

# Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #: {......

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Dry Weight:

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>05</sub>: 0.22 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.9 mg/L

95% C.I.: 0.11-0.46 mg/L 95% C.I.: 1.4-2.6 mg/L

Slope: 1.75±0.194

Growth Rate:

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>05</sub>: 0.31 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 2.8 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.19-0.50 mg/L

95% C.I.: 2.4-3.4 mg/L

Slope: 1.71±0.132

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number (most sensitive), dry weight, and growth rate

# D. STUDY DEFICIENCIES:

The deviations, including the reduced replicate size, were not considered to have impacted the study results, so they did not affect the acceptability or validity of the study.

# E. REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

The reviewer's conclusions were similar to the study authors'; however, the reviewer's toxicity calculations were based on the mean measured concentrations, while the study authors based calculations on the nominal concentrations. In addition, the reviewer determined toxicity values for frond number, as well as the  $EC_{05}$  values for all endpoints, and these are reported in the Executive Summary and Conclusions sections. Based on the reviewer's conclusions, frond number was the most sensitive endpoint, with an  $EC_{50}$  value of 1.5 mg/L.

F. CONCLUSIONS: This toxicity study is scientifically sound and satisfies the U.S. EPA Guideline Subdivision J, §123-2 for an aquatic vascular plant study with *Lemna gibba*. As a result, this study is classified as Core.

### Number of fronds:

NOEC: 0.29 mg/L

EC<sub>0s</sub>: 0.20 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.5 mg/L

95% C.I.: 0.10-0.39 mg/L 95% C.I.: 1.1-2.0 mg/L

Slope: 1.89±0.195

Dry Weight:

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>0s</sub>: 0.22 mg/L

95% C.I.: 0.11-0.46 mg/L

EC<sub>50</sub>: 1.9 mg/L Slope: 1.75±0.194

95% C.I.: 1.4-2.6 mg/L

Growth Rate:

NOEC: 0.53 mg/L

EC<sub>05</sub>: 0.31 mg/L EC<sub>50</sub>: 2.8 mg/L

95% C.I.: 0.19-0.50 mg/L 95% C.I.: 2.4-3.4 mg/L

Page 10 of 20

 $Data\ Evaluation\ Report\ on\ the\ acute\ toxicity\ of\ Mesosulfuron-methyl\ metabolite\ (AE\ F160459)\ to\ aquatic\ vascular\ plants\ Lemna\ gibba$ 

PMRA Submission #: {.....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Slope: 1.71±0.132

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number (most sensitive), dry weight, and growth rate

#### III. REFERENCES:

- Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, Draft OECD Guideline for Testing of Chemicals Guideline: Lemna, Growth Inhibition Test, April 1997.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1982 Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Subdivision J, Hazard Evaluation: Nontarget Plants; Tier 2 of nontarget area testing; §123-2 Growth and reproduction of aquatic plants.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), April 1996, Ecological Effects Test Guidelines; OPPTS 850.4400 Aquatic Plant Toxicity Test Using Lemna spp., Tiers I and II; EPA 712-C-96-156, Public Draft.
- ASTM (1991). Standard Guide for Conducting Static Toxicity Test With Lemna gibba G3. American Society for Testing and Materials. E 1415-91
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1983. Toxic Substances Control; Good Laboratory Practice Standards; Final Rule (40 CFR Part 792) Fed. Reg., Vol. 48, No. 230, Nov. 23, 1983, pp. 53922-53944.
- SAS Institute Inc., 1989. Release 6.08 TS 407. Cary, North Carolina 27511.

PMRA Submission #: [.....]

EPA MRID#: 45386311

# APPENDIX I. OUTPUT OF REVIEWER'S STATISTICAL RESULTS:

frond number

File: 6311fn

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

ANOVA TABLE

		ANOVA TABLE			
					_
SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	
Between	9	156256.133	17361.793	706.712	-
Within (Error)	20	491.333	24.567		
Total	29 -	156747.467			-

Critical F value = 2.39 (0.05,9,20)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho: All groups equal

frond number

File: 6311fn

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	control	191.667	191.667		
2	0.10	191.000	191.000	0 165	
3	0.17	190.667	190.667	0.165	
4	0.29	188.667	188.667	0.247	
5	0.53	177.000	177.000	0.741	
6	0.93	168.000	168.000	3.624	*
7	1.7	67.667	67.667	5.848	*
8	3.0	40.000	40.000	30.640	*
9	5.3	27.667	27.667	37.477	*
10 .	9.6	23.000	23.000	40.524 41.677	*

frond number

File: 6311fn Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST -	TABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

MIKA Submis	sion #. {				EPA MRID#: 4538631
1	control	3			
2	0.10	3	10.522	5.5	0.667
3	0.17	3	10.522	5.5	1.000
4	0.29	3	10.522	5.5	3.00C
5	0.53	3	10.522	5.5	14.667
6	0.93	3	10.522	5.5	23.667
7	1.7	3	10.522	5.5	124.000
5	3.0	3	10.522	5.5	151.667
9	5.3	3	10.522	5.5	164.000
1 C	9.6	3	10.522	5.5	168.667

frond number

File: 6311fn Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	WILLIAMS TEST (Isoto	nic	regression mod	el) TABLE 1 0	F 2
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	control	3	191.667	191,667	101 667
2	0.10	3	191.000	191.007	191.667
3	0.17	3	190.667	190.667	191.000 190.667
4	0.29	3	188.667	188.667	188.667
5	0.53	3	177.000	177,000	177.000
6	0.93	3	168.000	168.000	168.000
7	1.7	3	67.667	67.667	67.667
8	3.0	3	40.000	40.000	40,000
9	5.3	3	27.667	27.667	27.667
10	9.6	3	23.000	23.000	23.000

frond number

File: 6311fn Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST	Isctonic:	regression	model)	TABLE 2 C	F 2
IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
control 0.10 0.17 <b>0.29</b> 0.53 0.93 1.7	191.667 191.000 190.667 <b>188.667</b> 177.000 168.000 67.667 40.000	0.165 0.247 <b>0.741</b> 3.624 5.848 30.640 37.477		1.72 1.81 1.83 1.85 1.86 1.86	k= 1, v=20 k= 2, v=20 k= 3, v=20 k= 4, v=20 k= 5, v=20 k= 6, v=20 k= 7, v=20

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submi	33.011	}					EP	A MRI
	٠.٠	23.000	41.0/5	*	1.87 1.87	1e	0	20
s = 4.95	) b							
Note: df us	sed for tabl	le values a	are approx	imate whe	en v > 20.			
Istimates c								
Parameter	Estimate	 95% Bou	 inds					
		Lower	Upper	oca.Err	/Estima	souna		
IC5	0.20	0.10	0.39	0 14	/ESCIMA	te		
CIO	0.31	0.18	0.56	0.14	0.52			
C25	0.66	0.43	1 0	0.12	0.56			
C50	0.20 0.31 0.66 1.5	1.1	2.0	0.091	0.65 <b>0.7</b> 5			
!Poor fit:	ppe = 1	based on 1	NF= 7	00 00	. n			
					<del>-</del>			
liFN : fro	nd number							
served vs.	ond number  Predicted	Treatment	Group Man	~ -				
served vs.	end number Predicted	Treatment	Group Mean	ns 				
served vs.	Predicted #Reps.	Treatment Obs.	Group Mean Pred.	ns  Obs.		*Chango		
pose	Predicted #Reps.	Treatment Obs. Mean	Group Mean Pred. Mean	ObsPred.	Pred.	%Change		
served vs. Dose	Predicted #Reps.	Treatment Obs. Mean	Group Mean Pred. Mean	ObsPred.	Pred.	%Change		
served vs. Dose	Predicted #Reps.	Treatment Obs. Mean	Group Mean Pred. Mean 202. 199.	ObsPred10.0 -8.01	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7	%Change 0.00		
Dose 0.00 0.100 0.170	Predicted Predicted #Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00	Treatment Obs. Mean 192. 191.	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194.	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7	*Change 0.00 1.32		
Dose  0.00  0.100  0.170	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00	Treatment Obs. Mean 192. 191. 191.	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194.	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7	*Change 0.00 1.32		
Dose  0.00  0.100  0.170  0.290  0.530  0.930	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 197.	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162.	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7		
Dose  0.00  0.100  0.170  0.290  0.530  0.930	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168.	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162.	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7		÷
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1		
Dose  0.00  0.100  0.170  0.290  0.530  0.930  1.70  3.00  5.30	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0 27.7 23.0	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4 30.2 12.9	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4 -2.58 10.1	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0 27.7 23.0	Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4 30.2 12.9	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4 -2.58 10.1	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0 27.7 23.0	Fred. Pred. Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4 30.2 12.9  TRANSFORM	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4 -2.58 10.1	Pred. %Control 100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0 27.7 23.0	Fred.  Pred.  Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4 30.2 12.9  TRANSFORM	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4 -2.58 10.1	Pred. %Control  100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4 15.0 6.38	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6		
Dose  0.00 0.100 0.170 0.290 0.530 0.930 1.70 3.00 5.30 9.60  y weight le: 6311dw	#Reps.  3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	Treatment  Obs. Mean  192. 191. 191. 189. 177. 168. 67.7 40.0 27.7 23.0  AN	Fred.  Pred.  Mean  202. 199. 194. 184. 162. 131. 92.5 57.4 30.2 12.9  TRANSFORM	ObsPred10.0 -8.01 -3.51 4.97 15.1 36.5 -24.8 -17.4 -2.58 10.1	Pred. %Control  100. 98.7 96.3 91.1 80.3 65.2 45.9 28.4 15.0 6.38	%Change 0.00 1.32 3.72 8.91 19.7 34.8 54.1 71.6 85.0 93.6		

2015.014

29

# Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #: {.....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Critical F value = 2.39 (0.05, 9, 20)Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

dry weight

File: 6311dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - TABLE 1 OF 2		Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>		
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	control	23.400	-23.400		
2	0.10	23.267	23.267	0 076	
Ξ	0.17	23.067	23.067	0.276	
4	0.29	23.067		0.690	
5	0.53	22.667	23.067	0.690	
6	0.93	21.900	22.667	1.518	
7	1.7		21.900	3.105	*
8	3.0	10.833	10.833	26.015	*
g.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5.700	5.700	36.642	*
10	5.3	5.767	5.767	36.504	*
	9.6	3.900	3.900	40.369	*

Dunnett table value = 2.60 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=20,9)

dry weight

File: 6311dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - '	TABLE 2 OF	2 но:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	§ of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
. 1	control	3	*		
2 3	0.10 9.17	3 3	1.256	5.4	0.133
4	0.29	3	1.256 1.256	5.4 5.4	0.333 0.333
6	0.53 0.93	3 3	1.256	5.4	0.733
7 8	1.7	3	1.256 1.256	5.4 5.4	1.500 12.567
9	3.0 5.3	3	1.256 1.256	5.4	17.700
10 	9.6	3	1.256	5.4 5.4	17.633 19.500

dry weight

# Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #: {.....

EPA MRID#: 45386311

File: 6311dw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	WILLIAMS TEST (ISOTO			el) TABLE 1 0	s
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N 	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1_	control	3	23.400	23.400	23.400
2	C.10	3	23,267	23.267	23.267
3	0.17	3	23.067	23.067	23.067
4	0.29	3	23.067	23.067	23.067
5	0.53	3	22.667	22.667	22.667
6	0.93	3	21.900	21.900	21.900
7	1.7	3	10.833	10.833	10.833
8	3.0	3	5.700 -	5.700	5.733
9	5.3	3	5.767	5.767	5.733
10 	9.6	3	3.900	3.900	3.900

dry weight

File: 6311dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2 O	F 2
IDENTIFICATION	ISCTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
control 0.10 0.17 0.29 <b>0.53</b> 0.93 1.7 3.0 5.3 9.6	23.400 23.267 23.067 23.067 <b>22.667</b> 21.900 10.833 5.733 5.733	0.276 0.690 0.690 1.518 3.105 26.015 36.573 36.573 40.369	* * *	1.72 1.81 1.83 1.85 1.86 1.86 1.86 1.87	k= 1, v=20 k= 2, v=20 k= 3, v=20 k= 4, v=20 k= 5, v=20 k= 6, v=20 k= 7, v=20 k= 8, v=20
	·			1.0/	k = 9, v = 20

s = 0.592

Note: df used for table values are approximate when  $v \, \geq \, 20$ .

Estimates of EC%

		·				
Parameter	Estimate	95% Box	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
EC5 EC10 EC25 EC50	0.22 0.36 0.79 1.9	Dower 0.11 0.19 0.50 1.4	Upper 0.46 0.67 1.3 2.6	0.15 0.13 0.097 0.061	/Estimate 0.48 0.54 0.63 0.75	

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submission #:: ......

EPA MRID#: 45386311

Slope = 1.75 Std.Err. = 0.194

!!!Poor fit: p < 0.001 based on DF= \_\_\_\_\_\_

7.00

20.0

6311DW : dry weight

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

#Reps. Dose Obs. Pred. Obs. Pred. %Change Mean Mean ~Pred. %Control 

 0.00
 3.00
 23.4
 24.5
 -1.13
 100.
 0.00

 0.100
 3.00
 23.3
 24.2
 -0.959
 98.8
 1.23

 0.170
 3.00
 23.1
 23.7
 -0.662
 96.7
 3.26

 0.290
 3.00
 23.1
 22.7
 0.381
 92.5
 7.51

 0.530
 3.00
 22.7
 20.5
 2.14
 83.7
 16.3

 0.930
 3.00
 21.9
 17.4
 4.48
 71.0
 29.0

 1.70
 3.00
 10.8
 13.2
 -2.38
 53.9
 46.1

 3.00
 3.00
 5.70
 9.05
 -3.35
 36.9
 63.1

 5.30
 3.00
 5.77
 5.44
 0.327
 22.2
 77.8

 9.60
 3.00
 3.90
 2.74
 1.16
 11.2
 88.8

growth rate

File: 6311g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

		•		
SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	9	0.4316	0.0480	480.000
Within (Error)	20	0.0012	0.0001	
Total	29	0.4328		
<b></b>	~			

Critical F value = 2.39 (0.05,9,20)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

growth rate

File: 6311g

Transform: NC TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST -	TABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Control <tr< th=""><th>eatment</th><th></th></tr<>	eatment	
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
-	control	0.396	0.396		

Page 17 of 20

Ė

Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

MRA Submission #: \			EPA MRID#: 4	<u> 1538</u> 6:
2	0.395 0.395 0.393 0.385 0.377 0.247 0.172 0.119 0.093	0.395 0.395 0.393 0.385 0.377 0.247 0.172	0.041 0.082 0.286 1.347 2.286 18.167 + 27.434 +	

Dunnett table value = 2.60 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=20,9)

growth rate

File: 6311g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST -	TABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	:Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	control	3		~~	
2	0.10	3	0.021	5.4	0.000
3	0.17	3	0.021	5.4	0.000
4	0.29	3	0.021		0.001
5	0.53	3	0.021	5.4	0.002
6	0.93	3	0.021	5.4	0.011
7	1.7	3	0.021	5.4	0.019
8	3.0	3	<del>-</del>	5.4	0.148
9	5.3	3	0.021	5.4	0.224
10	9.6	3	0.021	5.4	0.276
	J.U	ა 	0.021	5.4	0.303

growth rate

File: 6311g Transform: NC TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST	(Isotonia	regression model:	Where a .
		grobbion model,	TABLE 1 OF 2

				11.0000	)£ _
GRCUP	IDENTIFICATION	N 	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CONTROL  0.10  0.17  0.29  0.53  0.93  1.7  3.0	0000000000	0.396 0.395 0.395 0.393 0.385 0.377 0.247	0.396 0.395 0.395 0.393 0.385 0.377 0.247 0.172	0.396 0.395 0.395 0.395 0.393 0.385 0.377 0.247 0.172

Page 18 of 20

# Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants $Lemna\ gibba$

PMRA Submission #	.;				EPA MRID#: 45386311
9 10	5.3 9.6	3 3	0.119 0.093	0.119 0.093	0.119 0.093

growth rate

File: 6311g

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2 C	F 2
IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
control	0.396				
0.10	0.395	0.053		1 70	
0.17	0.395	0.105		1.72	k = 1, v = 20
0.29	0.393	0.369		1.81	k = 2, v = 20
0.53	0.385	1.739		1.83	k = 3, v = 20
0.93	0.377	•		1.85	k= 4, <del>v=</del> 20
		2.951	*	1.86	k = 5, v = 20
1.7	0.247	23.454	*	1.86	k = 6, v = 20
3.0	0.172	35.418	*	1.86	• = =
5.3	0.119	43.692	*		k = 7, v = 20
9.6	0.093	47.909	*	1.87	k = 8, v = 20
	5.055	47.909	^	1.87	k = 9, v = 20

s = 0.008

Note: df used for table values are approximate when  $v\,>\,20\,.$ 

Estimates of EC%

	<del></del>		· <b></b>			
Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	ınds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
EC5	0.31	Lower 0.19	Upper 0.50	0.10	/Estimate	
EC10 EC25	0.51 1.1	0.34 0.87	0.75 1.5	0.085	0.67	
EC50	2.8	2.4	3.4	0.059 <b>0.035</b>	0.76 <b>0.85</b>	

Slope = 1.71 Std.Err. = 0.132

!!!Poor fit: p < 0.001 based on DF= 7.00 20.0

6311G : growth rate

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

		. reacmen	t Group N	leans			
Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred.	*Change	
0.00 0.130 0.170	3.00 3.00 3.00	0.396 0.395 0.395	0.409 G.467 0.462	-0.0136 -0.0113 -0.00679	100. 99.3 98.2.	0.00 0.653 1.84	

Page 19 of 20

# Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Mesosulfuron-methyl metabolite (AE F160459) to aquatic vascular plants Lemna gibba

PMRA Submiss	sion #: {					EPA MRID#: 45386311
0.290	3.00	0.393	0.391	0.00253	95.5	
0.530	3.00	0.385	0.366	0.0189	95.5 89.4	4.52 10.6
0.930	3.00	0.377	0.326	0.0509	79.7	20.3
1.70 3.00	3.00	0.247	0.266	-0.0183	64.9	35.1
5.30	3.00 3.00	0.172 0.119	0.198	-0.0268	48.5	51.5
9.60	3.00	0.0927	0.132 0.0754	-0.0128 0.0173	32.3 18.4	67.7 81.6

Page	is not included in this copy.
Pages	$\frac{30}{100}$ are not included in this copy.
The minfor	aterial not included contains the following type of mation:
· 	Identity of product inert ingredients.
<del>-</del>	Identity of product impurities.
·	Description of the product manufacturing process.
	Description of quality control procedures.
	Identity of the source of product ingredients.
<del> </del>	Sales or other commercial/financial information.
	A draft product label.
<del></del>	The product confidential statement of formula.
	Information about a pending registration action.
<u>//</u>	FIFRA registration data.
	The document is a duplicate of page(s)
	The document is not responsive to the request.

The information not included is generally considered confidential by product registrants. If you have any questions, please contact the individual who prepared the response to your request.